

The Sun

TUESDAY, APRIL 30, 1895.

Advertisements for THE WEEKLY SUN, issued on every morning, will be landed in this column before 6 o'clock.

Local News.—The City and Suburban News Bureau of the SUN, 100 Nassau street, New York, has just published a book of 100 pages, containing a full and complete list of the names of the persons who have been elected to the various offices of the City of New York.

Not Our Business to Pay the \$75,000.

So far as we know, the *Public Ledger* of Philadelphia is the first important newspaper to propose the settlement of the Nicaragua trouble as here indicated:

"The cheapest thing the United States could do would be to advance the money or enter surety for its payment."

It is evident that our esteemed contemporary is not speaking seriously.

Encouraged and applauded by Ambassador BAYARD, the British Government has proceeded to collect by force an unadjudicated claim of \$75,000 against Nicaragua, the justice of which is not admitted by the latter. War between the two countries is out of the question, for England is very strong and Nicaragua weak. The strong nation has descended upon the weak nation and occupied part of her territory.

It is not the business of the United States to pay claims against other American republics, or to become surety for them. But it is the business of the United States to remember now and at all times that the occupation of any portion of this continent by any European power, on any pretext whatsoever, concerns us vitally.

"The American continents," declared President MONROE, upon the advice of THOMAS JEFFERSON, JAMES MADISON, and JOHN QUINCY ADAMS, "are henceforth not to be considered as subjects for future colonization by any European powers." As to existing independent Governments, the Doctrine further declares: "We could not view any interference for the purpose of oppressing them, or controlling in any other manner their destiny, by any European power, in any other light than as the manifestation of an unfriendly disposition toward the United States."

Overpowering Nicaragua.

The spectacle now presented on the Isthmus is a sorry one. The greatest naval power of Europe is engaged in coercing a helpless little American republic, and the Government of the United States stands by, perhaps not abetting this business, but thus far not interfering with it.

And Nicaragua's troubles have only begun. The British flag floats at Corinto; trade is paralyzed there, and many of the people have fled. It is feared that England may, as a next step in forcing the republic to submit, blockade Greytown, seize Bluefields, or bombard Corinto. The Government is made anxious by disturbances and already we hear of plots to overthrow President Zelaya and of the refusal of CANZAS, just displaced as the Governor of the Mosquito Territory, to obey the order for his recall.

Meanwhile the English press thinks it sufficient to remark that Nicaragua might have avoided all trouble by giving up at once the money demanded. The real point is that, while England, through members of her Parliament, has been urging upon the United States the beauties and blessings of arbitration, Nicaragua's desire to apply it is rejected, and she is ordered to get down on her knees and accept instead the law of the stronger. And this goes on, if not with the approval of our Government, at least without its effective remonstrance.

England's ground for her high-handed course is that Nicaragua affronted her. But it is difficult to believe that in excluding Mr. HATCH from the country, Nicaragua purposely insulted Great Britain. The facts are simple. Nicaragua, exercising her sovereignty over the Mosquito Reserve, had deposed Chief CLAMENCE, neither the British Government nor our own Government, after long negotiations, at Bluefields suddenly overruled Nicaragua's authority, and restored CLAMENCE. The change was brief, and with the reappearance of Nicaragua forces the lawful status was restored. Nicaragua ascribed the revolt to the influence of the foreign resident traders; and, impressed with the need of guarding against a repetition of it, she expelled some of those whom she believed to be at fault, among them being Vice-Consul HATCH. England chose to regard his banishment as an insult to her, although Nicaragua insisted that she had never given him an exequatur. But even if the evidence shows that he had been officially recognized, it can hardly be supposed that Nicaragua intended to affront Great Britain in his person. She also expelled American residents, and nobody accuses her of seeking to insult the United States.

Admitting that she committed an injustice in her anger or trepidation, she has already recalled her decree of exile against him. British and American residents, it would, therefore, seem quite sufficient to make a formal apology to England, and then agree to pay such pecuniary damages as an impartial arbitrator might assess. But England insisted instead on fixing herself a fine of \$75,000, without taking the opinion of an arbitrator, with a smaller sum of \$2,500, and a reference of other damages to a Commission, and exacted that these demands should be complied with by a day fixed. Finally she landed her forces at Corinto.

Does it not appear that such terms are the arrogant coercion of a little power by a great one? Would England have attempted to enforce them against Germany, Russia, or the United States? Yet in all this our Government has seen no opportunity for effective discussion or for the skilful and friendly substitution of a less humiliating form of remedy. Its persuasive influence has not been successfully exerted up to the present writing, so that the question even is discussed whether England will not feel encouraged to threaten to destroy Corinto with her guns, before the Administration is able to suggest some form of settling the dispute which both the big power and the little one can accept.

The Silver Blazes on the Prairie.

For several years we have been told that the West was ablaze with a desire for free silver. Let us compare this statement with a report, found in the *Grand Rapids Democrat*, on a district recently burned over.

In the fall of 1894 there was a free silver candidate for Governor of Michigan, FISHBECK, "distinguished," says the *Grand Rapids Journal*, "for personal popularity and energetic campaigning." The platform had in it no element of hesitation, uncertainty, or straddle. It was for free coinage, at 16 to 1, and the majority against it was 106,392.

Seeing that their issue had been too much

weighted with the general feeling against Congress and the tariff for its friends to be marshalled in full force, the silverites determined to try again when they could monopolize the public interest. So this year, again controlling the Democratic organization, they chose an unexceptionable candidate, fully equal to his opponent, we are assured, in personal, political, and legal qualities." Then they declared for free silver at 16 to 1, and again they were beaten by the most overwhelming majority ever given in Michigan, barring the one at the Congressional elections of last fall. The 1895 majority of Michigan against free silver was 80,487.

The Indians used to burn the prairies to get a good big crop of grass at the next growth. The fires of free silver seem to raise a tremendous crop of votes on the other side.

The False History of Reform.

An official history of the so-called Reform movement led by the Committee of 70 has been published in a handsome quarto volume of nearly 400 pages. It is entitled "The Triumph of Reform," and in a subtitle the election of the ticket headed by Col. STROGO is described as "the great political revolution of Nov. 6, 1894."

An introductory essay celebrates and glorifies "this uprising" as having "effected what appears to be a permanent lodgment in the popular mind of the non-partisan idea of city government." This idea "has passed from the stage of pious opinion and obtained a foothold in practical politics." "It is the final adoption of a new agency in the work of municipal administration." Another "essentially new feature of the process of agitation by which the late victory was won," is described as "the formation of the various clubs and organizations." "Intended to supply that visible sign of mutual sympathy and support without which continuous unity of action is not possible." One of the most important of those political machines, according to this narrative, was the GRACE faction of the Democracy, an organization which, through its leader, has now repudiated "the non-partisan idea of city government," and contemptuously described it as a mere "fad." In the minds of those practical politicians, at least, it has obtained neither foothold nor lodgment.

In truth, as this history shows conclusively, it never obtained any "foothold in practical politics," but was conceived and passed forward solely as a pious device, a mere subterfuge. The Committee of 70 issued an address to the people soon after its organization, laying down as its cardinal principles the absolute divorce of municipal government "from party politics and from selfish personal ambition or gain," with the selection of candidates for public office "solely with reference to their ability and integrity." Then it proceeded to make up a ticket with reference only to the "availability" of the candidates, without regard to their character and qualifications, and solely for their "selfish personal ambition or gain." The story of the methods of the committee, as told in this volume, prepared for its glorification and under its direct supervision, is amusing as an unconscious revelation of unprincipled political trickery. Instead of looking simply to the ability and integrity of the candidates, it started out, says the record furnished by one of the members of its Executive Committee, "with a view to naming a ticket that might, on being submitted in conference, be at once acceptable to the organization," from which it was seeking votes. "Their vote-getting qualities" absorbed its attention.

First, therefore, GORF was picked out as the candidate for Mayor, in spite of his complete and notorious unfitness for the office, because "advantage must be taken of the tremendous anti-Tammany sentiment created by the Senate investigation." But the Republicans wouldn't have him. They demanded bluntly and peremptorily that "a Republican should head the ticket," or they would withdraw from the combination and put up a straight ticket of their own. GORF, accordingly, refused the nomination, for he has a keen perception of his selfish interests, and he knew that without the Republican support there was no chance of his election. The GRACE crowd would take only a Democrat. The German Reformers entertained the same prejudice, except that they were disposed under the compulsion of necessity to accept a Mugwump like Mr. SETH LOW. The O'BRIEN and STRICKLAND factions were anxious only to beat Tammany, and to that end were ready to take any available "vote-getting" candidate. The truth was that the Hon. JAMES O'BRIEN had already and long before slated Col. STROGO for the nomination, and he had done the preparatory work so adroitly and so thoroughly that after GORF backed out, the committee turned to "Wm. L. STROGO as the next most available man on its list for the Mayoralty." Availability and not fitness continued to be the test applied by those Reformers. The GRACE crowd kicked, but at the last moment its leader was conciliated, bought off, by getting all the rest of the candidates on the ticket, and obviously by an understanding that his man SCOTT should be made Corporation Counsel, an office desirable in its emoluments and powerful in its patronage, though SCOTT has no special legal fitness for it. This evident understanding Mayor SCOTT carried out faithfully as soon as the power of Removal law gave him the opportunity. He is accused perfectly to other politicians, but ROWENOW GRACE has no reason to complain of him on that score. He has looked after GRACE's heeled voters generously, and now, having secured these practical fruits of Reform, ROWENOW gets out of the combination and all responsibility for it, laughing at the whole business as childish folly. It is notable that among the more than two hundred portraits of Reformers with which this volume is embellished, the face of the Hon. SHAMUS O'BRIEN does not appear. That name is mentioned neither in the history nor in the long biographical index with which it concludes. GRACE is there, GODKIN is prominent everywhere, pictorially and in the text, but his fellow Irish Reformer is excluded absolutely, though of all the supporters of the "uprising" and of the ticket none was more loyal, more ardent, or more industrious than the Hon. SHAMUS O'BRIEN, the discoverer of Col. STROGO and the most influential factor in bringing about his nomination.

The rest of the ticket at the head of which Col. STROGO was put by adroit manipulation, was, as a whole, as bad as it could be made. The only really reputable candidate besides him was Mr. BEKMAN, a lawyer of fair abilities, who was known almost wholly as a professional politician. Generally they had no fitness whatever for their places, and not one of them was nominated with any reference to his qualifications. It is not probable that any of them was known personally to the members of the committee, or had been heard of by those gentlemen. They were equally unknown to the public, having

only a narrow local reputation as petty politicians on the hunt for office. The "Triumph of Reform" is further made up of uttering histories of Goo Goo German Reformers, and others of the allied Reformers, their portraits profusely adorning its pages, and their biographies filling out the voluminous index. A large part of them are young men, who now enjoy the distinction of appearing in these pages more perhaps than they will prize it in the future; for the "triumph" which this pretentious history describes as a "great political revolution" has already turned out to be a practical defeat of that revolution. It has resulted in the non-partisan idea of city government beyond the hope of resurrection for many, many years to come, if not finally; and in accomplishing that result it has rendered a service to true and sound politics as valuable that its occurrence affords reason for general rejoicing. It has demonstrated to all the people and to every party the utter fallacy of that product of unphilosophical minds, and its inherent humbug and impracticability. Already the really sane Reformers have thrown it aside as worthless and impossible. Now the people will go back permanently to honest and reasonable politics. The period of political hysteria is over.

Black and White.

We have a letter from a lifelong thinker asking us to explain "why it is that negroes, as a rule, better tempered than white men." This is one of the deepest questions we have ever been called upon to answer.

We guess the assumption of our correspondent is correct, that blacks are ordinarily better tempered than whites. It is sustained by our own observation, not only where the blacks are a small element of the population, but also in those parts of the South in which they form a majority. We could give larger illustrations than those here offered by our correspondent:

"See how the boys find it out. They will jump upon a truck driven by a colored man and take a ride, but they fear the whip of a white driver. I have always noticed that negro waters do not get angry so quickly as German, Irish, French, or Italian waters. Negroes, as pictured in the comic papers, are nearly always grinning. Negro minstrelsy is mostly good natured laughing."

Very well. It is so. If our correspondent were to enlarge his experience by travelling over the South, from the Potomac to the Yaddin, the Congaree, the Yalobusha, and the Brazos, he would everywhere receive confirmation of his opinion. There are, indeed, sullen, or soured, or crabbed, or irascible blacks; but, as a rule, the negro is good-tempered. Even when a slave he was so, and often far more so than his white master. He is truly very patient.

Now we reach the great question. "Why is it?" asks our correspondent. Well, this "why" is a word which both sides use very often. Why is one baby black and another white, or why has the black a wool on its little head and the white one half? Why the differences between races which we see when we look at mankind, differences in feature, in mind, in bodily conformation, in moral quality? Look at a Seminole Indian, for example, as he stands in the picture books, and then at a New York Mugwump hunting for an honorable and profitable municipal office. Look at a Calumuck in the face, and then at a typical Peckskiller. Why the difference? Gaze upon a Chinaman in Pell street, and next upon a Colorado Pelletier or a Wall street gold bug. Why again? Think of a Bedouin on the gallop and a Hindoo sitting squat like Buddha. The Norwegian differs from the Portuguese, the Brazilian from the Yankee, the Hebrew from the Irishman, the Parisian from the Papuan, and a fat Dutch Boer from a lean Patagonian. Why? GROVER CLEVELAND does not resemble Judge PLYOR any more than Mayor STROGO resembles "Back Number" BRUNN. Why, again?

In this case, as in many another, we shall have to fall back upon the clergy for an answer. We are satisfied that the Rev. DR. ISAAC WATTS (born 1674; died 1748) indulged in meditation upon this subject, when, in writing one of the best known of his "Divine Songs," he came to the conclusion that the characteristics of some of our four-legged friends were the outgrowth of their nature:

"Let dogs delight to bark and bite,
For God hath made them so;
Let swains and hinds grow fat and light,
For 'tis their nature too."

It seems to us that here is the conclusion of the matter. We do not know that we can go any further in the way of explanation. The blacks are better tempered than the whites because of their nature. Why their nature? We'll give you a dollar to explain that. The "why" is a question in causation, a thing with which all the German philosophers have struggled for ages, without ever getting to the bottom of it, or piercing its surface, or reaching its edge, or approaching anywhere near to it. We know no more about it than old man ADAM knew when he took the apple from EVE. We can never know anything about it so long as we live. SCHOPENHAUER of Dantzig gave it up; the English and the French have given it up; so have the thoughtful people of Connecticut. That mystery of all white Americans, CHANCEY M. DEWEY, has never thrown a streak of light upon it.

Thus we must leave our inquiring correspondent in despair when he asks the old question, "Why is it?"

We can, however, give him something else to think of. While THE SUN is an advocate, and we trust, an example of good temper, we must confess that the best-tempered and most patient races in the world are not always on the best of terms. Look at our black friends, of whom he speaks. They have been enslaved since the time of old HAM, or a great part of them. The next blood race after the African is the Chinese, who *before* with a smile, who are trodden upon by the mandarin, ruled by a Tartar dynasty, submit to the lash of a yellow jacket without raising a rumpus, tolerate the Mugwump officeholders, and have been whipped by the English, the French, and the Japs; that is to say, by any race of people that knows how to get its back up, or, in other words, that has a temper. The Americans once in a while get their backs up, and the uses of that movement of nature have frequently been exemplified in our history.

Most of our great men have had a temper that could be quickened upon occasion. Even GEORGE WASHINGTON got very angry sometimes. Neither JEFFERSON nor JACKSON was always smooth as oil. People have seen ABRAHAM LINCOLN at times when he did not smile. The temper of WENDELL PHILLIPS was not as hot as that of GARRISON, but it became very warm under temptation. There never was a better-tempered American than EMERSON, the philosopher of the "Nature," who was a devoted friend of CARLYLE, the worst-tempered Scotchman that ever spent his life in scolding all creation. If the flaming man of Ecclefechan could have divided his fire with the cool-headed sage of Musketaquid, there would have been

more heat on the Concord River and less on the Thames.

We praise our colored American friends for their good temper. May they never lose it, never get roused except in case of necessity. We praise the industrious Chinese for the possession of the same quality, though it might be well for them to put a sharper edge upon it. We condemn the ever-growing, all-devouring British lion. We are pleased that BISMARCK has moderated his temper in his retirement. We think that GLADSTONE was in the right a few weeks ago when he got mad as a March hare over the wrongs of the good Christian Armenians at the hands of the Mohammedan Kurds.

What we want every time is the correct thing. When a man, white, black, or Chinese, sees another perpetrate a wrong, he may reprimand him. When he sees the world go as it ought to, he may possess his soul in peace.

Party Lines in New York and Brooklyn.

There will be a municipal election in Brooklyn this year, and in New York city several important local offices are to be filled. In both cities legislators are to be elected, under a new apportionment, to both the State Senate and the Assembly. New York is to choose 12 Senators and 85 Assemblymen; Brooklyn is to choose 7 Senators and 40 Assemblymen. Already political parties are looking forward to surprising changes, and are prognosticating results.

In this town the PLATT Republicans aver that the course of Mayor STROGO in ignoring them in his distribution of patronage, "is breaking up the Republican party." They declare that he is fomenting internal jealousies by recognizing only the minority faction of Republicans, and that the majority faction will protect itself by suitable measures of reprisal at an appropriate time. The anti-PLATT, or Union League, Republicans say that the Republican party is being "built up" by the Mayor as it never has been before. In Brooklyn there is a similar factional fight in the Republican ranks between the partisans of Mayor SCHIEREN on the one side, and the advocates and supporters of the Hon. J. A. K. E. WORTH on the other. It is feared by some Republicans that the party will be split in two in Kings, unless the friends of harmony come together and put an end to the fight.

On the Democratic side, in both cities, there is a similar rivalry. For several months past there have been conferences between the two factions of the Brooklyn Democratic regulars and the reformers, as if a formal union of these two wings of the party was all that was necessary to restore the Kings county Democracy to its former position of trust and prominence. At last year's election the candidate of the Democratic "regulars" for Register received 59,000 votes. The candidate of the Democratic "reformers" received 17,000 votes. It seems to be supposed that the forces of the two, if united, would have been invincible. Perhaps so, but the Republican nominee polled 85,000 votes; a majority of 9,000 over both Democratic factions.

The politicians of both parties seem to lose sight of one essential and important consideration. Local questions in both cities are overshadowed, and likely to be dominated, by politics not local. The Democratic party of to-day is completely on the defensive. Its most cherished traditions and teachings have been betrayed. Its ancient and time-honored principles have been dishonored or discredited. Many of its representatives were retired in November, 1894, by their dissatisfied and displeased constituents, and others would be so retired if, under the machinery of elections, it were possible for the voters to record their sentiments and wishes. The strength of the Democracy in New York and Brooklyn, citadels of its power, has been undermined, not from within, but from without. In the political tornado of 1893 the Democrats of New York city withstood the shock valiantly. The Democrats of Brooklyn were overwhelmed. In the greater and fiercer political cyclone of 1894 the Democrats of both cities were submerged, but their position was in no respect different from that of their Democratic brethren in other cities, St. Louis, Chicago, Philadelphia, Buffalo, Louisville, Boston, and Detroit. The cause of defeat here, as elsewhere, was not local, but national. A decided change for the better will come only when the relation between the two national parties is so far restored that there is a Democratic nominee no longer, in New York or Brooklyn, a handicap too burdensome for a fair chance at the polls.

The Republicans have undeniably enjoyed of late in both New York and Brooklyn political advantages to which, numerically, their party is not entitled, and which under ordinary conditions it could not hope to retain. In November, in this city, the Republican party was on the crest of the popular flood, and though the political waters have not since that time subsided to any visible extent, it would be unreasonable to expect that condition to be permanent. In New York the local Republicans have missed many of their opportunities, and disregarded many others. They have more to fear from apathy in their ranks, following a great victory, than from defections due to minor questions of patronage. While the division of the two great parties continues as it is now, an accumulation of Republican blunders hereabout, and on both sides of the bridge simultaneously, will be necessary to bring about a speedy Democratic restoration, although such restoration is inevitable later on.

The New Speaker of the House of Commons.

A good deal of interest attached to the election of Mr. GULLY to the Speakership of the House of Commons upon the resignation of that post by Mr. PEEL, who has been since the time of old HAM, or a great part of them. The next blood race after the African is the Chinese, who *before* with a smile, who are trodden upon by the mandarin, ruled by a Tartar dynasty, submit to the lash of a yellow jacket without raising a rumpus, tolerate the Mugwump officeholders, and have been whipped by the English, the French, and the Japs; that is to say, by any race of people that knows how to get its back up, or, in other words, that has a temper. The Americans once in a while get their backs up, and the uses of that movement of nature have frequently been exemplified in our history.

Most of our great men have had a temper that could be quickened upon occasion. Even GEORGE WASHINGTON got very angry sometimes. Neither JEFFERSON nor JACKSON was always smooth as oil. People have seen ABRAHAM LINCOLN at times when he did not smile. The temper of WENDELL PHILLIPS was not as hot as that of GARRISON, but it became very warm under temptation. There never was a better-tempered American than EMERSON, the philosopher of the "Nature," who was a devoted friend of CARLYLE, the worst-tempered Scotchman that ever spent his life in scolding all creation. If the flaming man of Ecclefechan could have divided his fire with the cool-headed sage of Musketaquid, there would have been

more heat on the Concord River and less on the Thames.

We praise our colored American friends for their good temper. May they never lose it, never get roused except in case of necessity. We praise the industrious Chinese for the possession of the same quality, though it might be well for them to put a sharper edge upon it. We condemn the ever-growing, all-devouring British lion. We are pleased that BISMARCK has moderated his temper in his retirement. We think that GLADSTONE was in the right a few weeks ago when he got mad as a March hare over the wrongs of the good Christian Armenians at the hands of the Mohammedan Kurds.

What we want every time is the correct thing. When a man, white, black, or Chinese, sees another perpetrate a wrong, he may reprimand him. When he sees the world go as it ought to, he may possess his soul in peace.

In this town the PLATT Republicans aver that the course of Mayor STROGO in ignoring them in his distribution of patronage, "is breaking up the Republican party." They declare that he is fomenting internal jealousies by recognizing only the minority faction of Republicans, and that the majority faction will protect itself by suitable measures of reprisal at an appropriate time. The anti-PLATT, or Union League, Republicans say that the Republican party is being "built up" by the Mayor as it never has been before. In Brooklyn there is a similar factional fight in the Republican ranks between the partisans of Mayor SCHIEREN on the one side, and the advocates and supporters of the Hon. J. A. K. E. WORTH on the other. It is feared by some Republicans that the party will be split in two in Kings, unless the friends of harmony come together and put an end to the fight.

On the Democratic side, in both cities, there is a similar rivalry. For several months past there have been conferences between the two factions of the Brooklyn Democratic regulars and the reformers, as if a formal union of these two wings of the party was all that was necessary to restore the Kings county Democracy to its former position of trust and prominence. At last year's election the candidate of the Democratic "regulars" for Register received 59,000 votes. The candidate of the Democratic "reformers" received 17,000 votes. It seems to be supposed that the forces of the two, if united, would have been invincible. Perhaps so, but the Republican nominee polled 85,000 votes; a majority of 9,000 over both Democratic factions.

The politicians of both parties seem to lose sight of one essential and important consideration. Local questions in both cities are overshadowed, and likely to be dominated, by politics not local. The Democratic party of to-day is completely on the defensive. Its most cherished traditions and teachings have been betrayed. Its ancient and time-honored principles have been dishonored or discredited. Many of its representatives were retired in November, 1894, by their dissatisfied and displeased constituents, and others would be so retired if, under the machinery of elections, it were possible for the voters to record their sentiments and wishes. The strength of the Democracy in New York and Brooklyn, citadels of its power, has been undermined, not from within, but from without. In the political tornado of 1893 the Democrats of New York city withstood the shock valiantly. The Democrats of Brooklyn were overwhelmed. In the greater and fiercer political cyclone of 1894 the Democrats of both cities were submerged, but their position was in no respect different from that of their Democratic brethren in other cities, St. Louis, Chicago, Philadelphia, Buffalo, Louisville, Boston, and Detroit. The cause of defeat here, as elsewhere, was not local, but national. A decided change for the better will come only when the relation between the two national parties is so far restored that there is a Democratic nominee no longer, in New York or Brooklyn, a handicap too burdensome for a fair chance at the polls.

The Republicans have undeniably enjoyed of late in both New York and Brooklyn political advantages to which, numerically, their party is not entitled, and which under ordinary conditions it could not hope to retain. In November, in this city, the Republican party was on the crest of the popular flood, and though the political waters have not since that time subsided to any visible extent, it would be unreasonable to expect that condition to be permanent. In New York the local Republicans have missed many of their opportunities, and disregarded many others. They have more to fear from apathy in their ranks, following a great victory, than from defections due to minor questions of patronage. While the division of the two great parties continues as it is now, an accumulation of Republican blunders hereabout, and on both sides of the bridge simultaneously, will be necessary to bring about a speedy Democratic restoration, although such restoration is inevitable later on.

The New Speaker of the House of Commons.

A good deal of interest attached to the election of Mr. GULLY to the Speakership of the House of Commons upon the resignation of that post by Mr. PEEL, who has been since the time of old HAM, or a great part of them. The next blood race after the African is the Chinese, who *before* with a smile, who are trodden upon by the mandarin, ruled by a Tartar dynasty, submit to the lash of a yellow jacket without raising a rumpus, tolerate the Mugwump officeholders, and have been whipped by the English, the French, and the Japs; that is to say, by any race of people that knows how to get its back up, or, in other words, that has a temper. The Americans once in a while get their backs up, and the uses of that movement of nature have frequently been exemplified in our history.

Most of our great men have had a temper that could be quickened upon occasion. Even GEORGE WASHINGTON got very angry sometimes. Neither JEFFERSON nor JACKSON was always smooth as oil. People have seen ABRAHAM LINCOLN at times when he did not smile. The temper of WENDELL PHILLIPS was not as hot as that of GARRISON, but it became very warm under temptation. There never was a better-tempered American than EMERSON, the philosopher of the "Nature," who was a devoted friend of CARLYLE, the worst-tempered Scotchman that ever spent his life in scolding all creation. If the flaming man of Ecclefechan could have divided his fire with the cool-headed sage of Musketaquid, there would have been

more heat on the Concord River and less on the Thames.

We praise our colored American friends for their good temper. May they never lose it, never get roused except in case of necessity. We praise the industrious Chinese for the possession of the same quality, though it might be well for them to put a sharper edge upon it. We condemn the ever-growing, all-devouring British lion. We are pleased that BISMARCK has moderated his temper in his retirement. We think that GLADSTONE was in the right a few weeks ago when he got mad as a March hare over the wrongs of the good Christian Armenians at the hands of the Mohammedan Kurds.

What we want every time is the correct thing. When a man, white, black, or Chinese, sees another perpetrate a wrong, he may reprimand him. When he sees the world go as it ought to, he may possess his soul in peace.

under which he became a laughing stock not only to the Whigs, but to many of his own party, including CANNING, who dubbed him *the mad dog of the House*.

What was true of ADDINGTON is true also of Mr. GULLY, who up to the time of his election to the Speaker's chair he had never taken a leading part in parliamentary life. Mr. GULLY, indeed, has been a member of the House of Commons for nine years, but his voice has never been heard in debate, nor has he served on any important committee. It was ostensibly on this ground that he was strenuously opposed by the Unionists, who put forward Sir MATTHEW WHITE RIDLEY, an undeniably distinguished man who has sat in six Parliaments, been Chairman of grand committee, of innumerable select committees, and of one of the most important commissions, which in fact is known by his name. The nine Parliaments united with the Unionists in his support, and the result was that the Ministerial candidate, Mr. GULLY, was elected by a majority of but eleven votes. Nevertheless, after the contest was over, Mr. A. J. BALFOUR, in an admirable speech, assured the new Speaker that he had the good wishes and respect of the whole House, and it may seem a reasonable inference from this incident that the Unionists will not displace him should they be successful at the next general election.

For some fifty years the Speaker of the House of Commons had been chosen without a contest, in pursuance of a private arrangement between the leaders of the principal parties. Thus the Whig, Mr. C. SHAW-LEVEY, remained Speaker from 1839 to 1857, although the Tories were in power during a part of that time, and although they had originally opposed him. Mr. LEVEY was created Viscount EVERLEY, and was succeeded by Mr. JOHN EVELYN DENISON, who was four times elected, and on his retirement in 1872 became Viscount OSSINGTON. The next Speaker, Mr. HENRY BOEVERIE BRAND, was elected three times, and when he left the chair in 1884, was made Viscount HAMPTON. It will be observed that, for a long time back, the office of Speaker upon an ex-Speaker has been that of Viscount, and the precedents have been followed with Mr. PEEL. Formerly the title of Baron was deemed good enough.

There had been, in truth, but three contests for the Speakership, prior to the election of Mr. GULLY, in a century and a quarter. In 1770 Sir FLETCHER NORTON was chosen Speaker by 237 votes over 121 cast for Mr. TOWNSHEND. In 1835 there was a violent struggle, on which, according to GRIEVELL, much money was won and lost; the result was that the Whigs elected Mr. ABERCROMBY by 316 votes to 306 for the Tory candidate, Sir CHARLES SUTTON, who had been Speaker since 1817. Four years later, i. e., in 1839, Mr. C. SHAW-LEVEY was placed in the chair by a majority of only 18 over the Right Hon. H. GOLDBURN, the Tory nominee. Obviously, therefore, there is no lack of precedents should the Tories, as a body, prove less generous than Mr. BALFOUR, and insist upon choosing a Speaker of their own in the next House of Commons.

The Washington Arch, to be dedicated to-day with very splendid ceremony, is a political ornament to the city as well as an artistic ornament. It's a good thing to have here, and to look at forever. It has cost a large sum of money, which has been subscribed without a thought of celebrating anything except the men and events represented. It is the purest kind of patriotism, and in noticing the event of its dedication, it is no more than justice to say that for this noble monument we are indebted chiefly to the persistent and enthusiastic labors of the Secretary of the Arch Committee, Mr. WILLIAM HINKLELAND STEWART.

A thousand welcomes to the Vigilant! The clipper is home once more after making the run across the Atlantic in eighteen days, for a westward passage a marvel always, and at this time of year a phenomenon. She had hard luck on the other side, but it must be remembered that she did the work that she was sent to do. It was a disadvantage in the land-locked and crooked courses of the yacht clubs of Great Britain, that does not blot out her record here. That record stands "three straight," and consequently our yachtsmen are bound to give her three cheers.

We are indebted to a circular sent around in behalf of the Kosuth Monument Association for a very instructive display of the spirit back of the movements to erect statues to foreign patriots in New York. One portion of this circular says:

"KOSUTH must have a monument in one of the parks of this city. WASHINGTON has, LAFAYETTE has, MARSH has, GARIBOLDI has. KOSUTH's monument must be erected."

Because the citizens of this country have erected a monument to WASHINGTON, and one to LAFAYETTE, and one to MARSH, and one to GARIBOLDI, therefore, the Hungarians living here are fired with the ambition to place a statue of their national leader along with them. It is high time to stop and reverse the policy of putting up statues of foreigners from foreign natives. Some day, in the natural fitness of things, the statues of MARSH and GARIBOLDI, placed here in moments of extraneous enthusiasm, will disappear; and it would be much better for the Kosuth monument scheme to be allowed to drop out, instead of being kept alive and pushed.

The inhabitants of Oscar street in Buffalo are petitioning the Common Council to change the name of that street. Why should the name of Oscar be objectionable to Buffalo people? It's a good name.

What can be the influence which stops in the Senate the bill passed by the Assembly to enable the Commissioner of Street Cleaning to discharge his men offhand, for partisan or other purposes, without appeal or examination? The present law provides that a member of the uniform force may be dismissed upon "evidence" satisfactory to the Commissioner that he has been "guilty of any legal or criminal offense or neglect, or for violation of rules or neglect, or disobedience of orders, or incapacity, or absence without leave, or conduct injurious to the public peace, or welfare, or immoral conduct, or any breach of discipline." And "the true cause for such dismissal shall be entered in writing in a book to be kept for that purpose, which book shall be a public record."

These are the provisions of the law which the Reformers, of all factions and titles, the Larries and the Goo Goos, were in favor of when it was passed. It was enacted with the avowed purpose of securing street cleaners against removal except upon charges publicly recorded. The law was passed in 1884, and it has since been the best one in the past ten years or more in this respect. "I have paid more debts with 3-cent cotton than I ever did with ten," he said. "I am in better condition than ever before, and in this the fact of my being able to pay my debts with 3-cent cotton is a fact."

Senator Hoar and the Anasabuskitt Eagle. George Frisbie, you are more than right To damn the men who'd kill The glorious eagle, quest and pride Of Anasabuskitt Hill.

Why should they want to murder him? It takes no hunter's skill To slay a noble bird of prey, And he who would destroy the low Goo Anasabuskitt Hill.

On Anasabuskitt Hill above Each neighboring mountain crest, The visitors who come may see That eagle's home and nest.

And there on Anasabuskitt Hill, Where he has delighted to rest, Each patriot will hasten to Do honor to that guest.